

REMARKS

Claims 31-52 are pending. Claims 31 and 43 are currently amended. New claims 51 and 52 are currently added. Claims 1-30 have been canceled. Claims 43-50 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Support for the amendment to page 20 of the instant application, can be found in the specification, for example, on page 20, lines 15-19, wherein PCT Publication No. WO 01/96104 is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, and in turn, for example, in claims 14 and 20, and on page 8, line 4 to page 10, line 25; page 12, line 8 to page 15, line 29; and page 20, line 23 to page 23, line 28 of said PCT Publication No. WO 01/96104.

Support for the amendments to claims 31 and 43 can be found in the new paragraphs added to the instant application.

Support for the new claims 51 and 52 can be found in the new paragraphs added to the instant application.

§103 Rejections

-U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.)

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.).

The rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) should be withdrawn.

While not agreeing with the comments in the Advisory Action, to facilitate prosecution, claim 31 has been further amended to specify that the optical film specified in claim 31 is at least one of (a) a birefringent dielectric multilayer film that reflects at least 50% of light in a band at least 100 nm wide in a wavelength region of interest, wherein the film is heat set at a temperature sufficient to render the film capable of shrinking to conform without substantial wrinkling to a substrate having a compound curvature or (b) a birefringent dielectric multilayer film that reflects at least 50% of light in a band at least 100 nm wide in a wavelength region of interest, wherein the film is heat set at a temperature sufficient to enable the film to shrink at least about 0.4 % in both in-plane directions upon heating. There is no teaching or suggestion in either ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) or ‘203 (Soodak et al.) of such a film, nor is there other sufficient evidence of the same presented in the Advisory Action or Final Office Action.

Claim 32 (and new claims 51 and 52) depends from claim 31. Claim 31 is patentable, for example, for reasons given above. Thus, claim 32 (and new claims 51 and 52) should also be patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) should be withdrawn.

-U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,368,945 (Fujimori et al.)

Claims 33-35, and 37-42 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.).

The rejection of claims 33-35 and 37-42 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) should be withdrawn.

Claims 33-35 and 37-42 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 31. Claim 31 is patentable, for example, for reasons given above. ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) fails to overcome the deficiencies of ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above. Thus, claims 33-35, and 37-42 should also be patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claims 33-35 and 37-42 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) should be withdrawn.

-U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,368,945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,334,382 (Gourio).

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of ‘382 (Gourio).

The rejection of claim 36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of ‘382 (Gourio) should be withdrawn.

Claim 36 depends from claim 33. Claim 33 is patentable, for example, for reasons given above. ‘382 (Gourio) fails to overcome the deficiencies of ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above. Thus, claim 36 should also be patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claim 36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of ‘382 (Gourio) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

July 23, 2009

Date

By: /Gregory D. Allen/

Gregory D. Allen, Reg. No.: 35,048

Telephone No.: 651-736-0641

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833